



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the description of the syrinx τὸ δὲ ἕσω μέσον ἐστὶ τῷ περιττῷ is rendered "And the middle one is half way in size between the first and the last." May it not rather be an ingenious way of saying that the innermost is (exactly) the middle by reason of the entire number being odd? Interesting is the coincidence pointed out (viii. 3. 1) between πόλεως οὐκ ἀσήμεον and St. Paul's οὐκ ἀσήμεον πόλεως (Acts 21:39).

The paleographical evidence of the papyrus fragment, Mr. Gaselee thinks, forbids us to date the composition of Clitophon and Leucippe after 300 A.D. If the author was a Christian it must have been late and little. It is more probable that he was a lawyer.

PAUL SHOREY

---

*De Richardo Bentleio atque de ratione eius critica.* By THEODORUS LE ROUX. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1916. Pp. 60.

Few doctoral dissertations are epoch-making works, and that by Le Roux is no exception. In the main chapter he attempts to show by a classification of some of the readings defended by Bentley in his *Horace* what Bentley's critical method was. He depends chiefly on Keller and on the *Horazstudien* of Beck. The material is selected, not complete.

Chapter i gives a sketchy account of the great men of Europe living between 1600 and 1800. Mention is made of Milton and Bacon, but not of Shakespeare (perhaps the author believes Bacon wrote "Shakespeare"), of Defoe, Swift, Johnson, but not of Dryden or Pope, etc. The statement is made that at the time of Bentley's birth (1662) more than two centuries had elapsed since the rediscovery of the writings of antiquity. It was, in point of fact, more than three centuries. Le Roux holds that Bentley was concerned with the subject-matter rather than the form of the works which he handled. He quotes from Bentley himself to prove this, but a fuller quotation given in another connection shows that Bentley says that he is concerned only with the correctness of the text, not with the subject-matter.

Chapter ii deals with the influences affecting Bentley's nature, and chapter iii with the edition of Horace and the later works. It is brought out that his confidence in the correctness of his own judgment was due to the acclaim with which his earlier work, especially his edition of Callimachus and his dissertation on the letters of Phalaris, was received and to the continual controversies in which he was engaged as Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. As a result, reckless emendation became a habit with him. Another factor, not mentioned by Le Roux, is implicit in Bentley's own words in the Introduction to his *Horace*. In his day manuscripts were counted, not rated: quantity was the determining factor, not quality.

If fifteen manuscripts had one reading and fourteen had another, the former group might well be preferred. Bentley tired of this unscientific method and resorted to emendation. He says that one might as well emend as try to defend the reading of one manuscript against many. Though ahead of his age, he was not great enough to develop the scientific method of the nineteenth century. There is then no need to wonder, as does Le Roux, why Bentley made no great effort to become acquainted with foreign manuscripts. His principle, *Ratio et res ipsa centum codicibus potiores sunt*, is utterly at variance with the best practice of today. There are, however, those who still count that day lost on which they do not emend at least one passage in the Bentleian manner. It is not too much to say that Bentley's influence, direct or indirect, is partly responsible for this situation. We laugh at his emendations of *Paradise Lost* (Le Roux quotes VI, 513, "They found they mingled, and, with subtle art," emended by Bentley to "They pound, they mingle, and with sooty chark"), we reject many of his emendations of Greek and Roman authors, but some of us still use his methods. In his very greatness Bentley shows his weakness: strikingly successful in some of his emendations, he emends everything in sight; discovering the digamma in Homer, he sees digammas in every word of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The revelation of this weakness, so characteristic of scholars of all ages, should be enough to dispel the awe in which Bentley is still held.

The first three chapters cover less than nineteen pages and the rest of the book is taken up by chapter iv, on the errors which Bentley made and which were the cause of his many emendations. First it is shown by selected examples that he preferred readings of the manuscripts of Keller's third (and worst) class. Then the emendations are considered. Le Roux groups under Bentley's emendations many which were found by Bentley in earlier editions or in manuscripts. It is true that these readings came into prominence through Bentley's authority, but the failure to distinguish them from Bentley's own makes it impossible to appreciate the extent and nature of his work.

As an example of Bentley's "rationalizing" tendency Le Roux cites, among other examples, the famous *vepris . . . ad ventum* of *Carm.* i. 23. 5. This is still to be seen in some of our Horace texts, though it spoils the poetry of Horace's line. Bentley's lack of a poetic sense and of an appreciation of Horace's nature are illustrated by *Marsi* in *Carm.* i. 2. 39: *acer et Mauri peditis cruentum voltus in hostem*. Le Roux takes his defense of the manuscript reading *Mauri* from Beck. But another defense may be found in the word order, which has heretofore been ignored, so far as is known. Granting that the Mauri were usually horsemen, one may defend the meaning "unhorsed" for *peditis* by pointing out that *peditis* and *cruentum* are then the crucial words. This would seem to be indicated by their juxtaposition. The fight has been a desperate one; the Moor has wounded his enemy, but has been forced from his horse. They now glare at each other for a fleeting

moment before engaging in the death struggle—a statuesque situation worthy of a Myron.

Another group of examples illustrates Bentley's misuse or suppression of parallel passages. *Marsi* appears again in this group on account of the omission of certain parallel passages. Another group of examples shows how Bentley emended from the mere love of emending even where he admitted the correctness of the traditional reading. Another group illustrates miscellaneous errors, as of quantity in *Gyges* (*Carm.* ii. 17. 14). A final group, not clearly differentiated from the others, does injustice even to Bentley. For example, he is charged with wilful emendation in *Carm.* i. 23. 1 *vitas* (MSS, *vitat*). But *vitas* is found in a few manuscripts and in earlier editions; it is the generally accepted reading today—and Bentley does not even comment on it! Why pick on Bentley? He has enough to answer for.

In a final section two examples are given to show that Bentley can emend felicitously. As a matter of fact, one is not and the other may not be original with Bentley. Neither is universally accepted. The first is *Carm.* iii. 5. 15, *trahenti*, where Le Roux says: "Auctor noster coniecturam Canteri *trahenti* legit . . . Bentleius hoc loco feliciter emendat." When is an emendation not an emendation? Apparently it does not become one until Bentley accepts it. The other passage is *Serm.* ii. 4. 19, *musto* for *mixto*. This reading is found in one or more manuscripts (Keller and Holder's y, which includes manuscripts known to Bentley) and may not be original with him, though he put it forth as his own.

The dissertation is decidedly inferior to the other Amsterdam dissertation on Horace reviewed by the present reviewer in *Classical Philology*, VII, 510.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

---

*Modern Greek Stories.* Translated by DEMETRA VAKA and ARISTIDES PHOUTRIDES. New York: Duffield and Company. Pp. 270. \$1.90 net.

In the volume before us we have ten tales adequately translated by Demetra Vaka and Aristides Phoutrides. As one reads the book it is very easy to forget that there is a political Greece with its seething problems, or a sophisticated up-to-date capital city like Athens; for the atmosphere throughout is that of sea and shore and tiny hamlet. In choosing selections that breathe only this atmosphere the editors have incurred a little danger of giving a slightly one-sided impression to readers unfamiliar with the more advanced side of contemporary Greece, but this would be a *κίνδυνος ἀκίνδυνος* in the case of readers of *Classical Philology*. With this unimportant limitation, one may say that the tales are well chosen and thoroughly